REMARKS

An Office Action was mailed on July 28, 2004. A response with a one-month extension is was due on Sunday November 28, 2004. This response is being filed timely on Monday November 29, 2004.

Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, 17 and 19-27 are pending, of which claims 1, 17, 19, and 24 are independent claims.

By the foregoing, claims 17, 19, 20, 24, 25 and 27 are amended and claims 28-34 are newly added.

Independent claims 1, 19, 24 and dependent claims 2-6, 20, 21, 25, 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandenburg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,180,045) in view of Phillips et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,455) and McCoy (U.S. Patent No. 5,014,160). Furthermore, dependent claims 8-12, 14, 22, 23, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandenburg in view of Phillips and Hood, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,469). The disposition of independent claim 17 is unclear; applicant reads claim 17 to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandenburg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,180,045) in view of Phillips et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,455) and McCoy (U.S. Patent No. 5,014,160).

The present invention is directed toward electromagnetic shielding plates, structures and entertainment system.

As claimed by claim 1, the present invention includes a connecting strip having a tip portion in the shape of an arc in substantially point contact with the ground. Therein, the present invention attains a unique function to remove flux from the contact portion of the connecting strip and the ground during the process of fixing the two. This occurs in practice by pushing the flux remaining on the ground with arcuate shaped tip portion of the connecting strip when the flux is connection to the ground. This described in the specification from Pg. 9, line 26 to Pg. 10, line 16 as originally filed.

Neither Brandenburg, Phillips, McCoy or any combination thereof reasonably teach or suggest a shielding plate having a tip portion in the shape of an arc in substantially point contact with the ground nor a shielding plate having a tip portion in the shape of an arc in substantially point contact with the ground designed for removing flux from the ground.

The references individually and in combination at best suggest a shielding plate wherein once contact is made with the ground, the flux cannot be removed and remains disposed between the connecting strip and the ground. Hence, the electrical connection will not be secured. As such, the claim 1 not only has a claimed limitation not suggested or taught by the references, but also a unique function which attained by the claimed limitation. Accordingly the Examiner is

As now claimed by independent claims 19 and 24, the electromagnetic shielding structure includes a plurality of conductive connecting strips. Each strip has a portion that extends in a plane of the plate surface and a second portion that is disposed in a plane transverse to the plate surface. As now claimed by claim 17, the electromagnetic shielding structure includes a plurality of projections. Each projection comprises a first portion extending in the plane of the plate surface and a second portion extending in the plane of the side surface portion, the second portion terminating at the second edge. Support for the amendment may be found at least in Figures 1-7 and the specification as a whole.

None of the cited references teaches or suggests a conductive connecting strip having a first portion that extends in a plane of the plate surface and a second portion that is disposed in a plane transverse to the plate surface. Advantageously, the claimed electromagnetic shielding plate reduces stresses in the plate surface, because, in addition to the edge covering plate, a recessed or notched portion of the plate surface is also displaceable in response to external stresses. Thus, the shielding structure as a whole provides positive contact with the ground.

Brandenburg does not teach or suggest a connecting strip having a first portion that extends in a plane of the plate surface and a second portion that is disposed in a plane transverse to the plate surface as now claimed. Brandenburg discloses a tab (132) that is angled provided from a rim portion, which extends angularly from the plate surface. Furthermore, Brandenburg does not

teach the tip of the tab (132) pressing against the object to be covered as presently recited by claim 1. In fact, Brandenburg teaches that the tip of the tabs makes sliding engagement contact with a ground such that the tab (132) is limited in disengaging.

Neither Phillips nor Hood suggests using a plurality of conductive strips each having two portions which extend at an angle to one another through the edge and plate portion of the covering plate, as presently recited. Therefore, the combination of the references cited cannot render claims 17, 19 and 24, as amended, to obvious.

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's objections. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. All dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

Passage of this case to allowance is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

Hassan A. Shakir
Reg. No. 53,922
(212) 940.6489

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
PHONE: (212) 940-6489
FAX: (212) 940.8986
DOCKET NO.: SCET 17.735 **(100809-16164)**